CHICAGO JOURNALS

The Identifiability of Jews
Author(s): Leonard D. Savitz and Richard F. Tomasson
Source: *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 64, No. 5 (Mar., 1959), pp. 468-475
Published by: University of Chicago Press
Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/2773434
Accessed: 24-11-2015 07:35 UTC

REFERENCES

Linked references are available on JSTOR for this article:
http://www.jstor.org/stable/2773434?seq=1&cid=pdf-reference#references_tab_contents

You may need to log in to JSTOR to access the linked references.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

University of Chicago Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *American Journal of Sociology*.

http://www.jstor.org

This content downloaded from 131.111.164.128 on Tue, 24 Nov 2015 07:35:12 UTC
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

THE IDENTIFIABILITY OF JEWS[1]

LEONARD D. SAVITZ AND RICHARD F. TOMASSON

ABSTRACT

Six judges attempted to identify 91 students as Jewish or non-Jewish under three experimental conditions: on physiognomy alone; on physiognomy, speech, and gesture; and on physiognomy, speech, gesture, and name. Among the general findings are these: the Jewish students were correctly identified by physiognomy above chance expectation, 30 per cent of them being identified correctly by all six judges; Jews were taken for non-Jews more frequently than the reverse on all three tests; and physiognomy, speech, and gesture together were less valid clues than physiognomy alone.

This is a study to determine the extent to which Jews may be accurately identified and the clues by which this identification is made.

Herskovits[2] mentions a study on the identifiability of racial or national origin instituted by Franz Boaz some thirty years ago, of which the findings were never published. Freshmen entering various universities were asked during their first week of school, before they had become acquainted with one another, to complete questionnaires reporting their place of birth, that of their parents and grandparents, language spoken at home, "race," and the characteristics of this "race." Each was then individually observed by his classmates, who then indicated, without knowing his name, what they thought to be his origins, their degree of certainty in judging, and their reasons for so classifying him. Herskovits mentions that Boaz told him that at one of the New York colleges 40 per cent of the Italians were taken for Jews and that a similar percentage of Jews were taken for Italians.

Lund and Berg[3] asked eighteen judges—twelve college students and six high-school and college instructors—to identify 2,875 elementary, high-school, and college students as to "nationality origin and European background" and religious affiliation as "Jew" or "Christian." The judges made two judgments of each individual; the first solely on the basis of appearance, the second on appearance plus speech. Correct identification of Jews on the basis of appearance alone was only 44.2 per cent, but 92.2 per cent for Christians. Judgments based on appearance plus speech, however, raised the percentage of correct identification of Jews to 51.5 per cent, but the figure for Christians remained at 92.2 per cent. These figures are deceptive because the population judged contained a very large majority of non-Jews; about nine times as many Jews were called Christians as the reverse.

Allport and Kramer[4] gave a "racial awareness" test to 223 Harvard and Radcliffe students in conjunction with pencil-paper questionnaires to measure prejudice against and experience with minority groups. Each student was shown twenty slides, each of which showed the photograph of a male college student taken from a five-year-old Harvard yearbook. They were asked after a fifteen-second exposure whether they thought the photograph was that of a Jew or a non-Jew. "Don't know" responses were allowed. Half of the photographs, which were presented in random order, were of Jews and half were of non-Jews.

[1] This is a slightly revised version of a paper read at the annual meetings of the Eastern Sociological Society, Philadelphia, April, 1958.

[2] Melville J. Herskovits, "Who Are the Jews?" in Louis Finkelstein, *The Jews: Their History, Culture, and Religion* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1949), Vol. II, chap. xxx.

[3] Frederick H. Lund and Wilner C. Berg, "Identifiability of Nationality Characteristics," *Journal of Social Psychology*, XXIV (August, 1946), 77–83.

[4] Gordon Allport and Bernard M. Kramer, "Some Roots of Prejudice," *Journal of Psychology*, XXII (July, 1946), 9–39.

This content downloaded from 131.111.164.128 on Tue, 24 Nov 2015 07:35:12 UTC
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

Not one of the 223 students guessed all twenty correctly. The range was from 0 to 80 per cent correct judgments, with a median of 55.5 per cent correct (about eleven out of twenty). Students with higher total prejudice scores judged *more* faces to be Jewish than did students with lower scores. Students with higher anti-Semitic scores were more *correct* in their judgment. Both findings are significant at the 1 per cent level of confidence.

These findings have been further investigated in four additional studies, in which, as in the original research, photographs or lantern slides were used rather than actual observations of subjects, college students were employed as judges, and the degree of prejudice of the judges was determined.

Carter[5] had 290 students identify the "racial" background of 45 second-generation Mediterraneans, Jews, and North Europeans by lantern slides. He found that, when a twofold classification into Jewish and non-Jewish faces was made, 61 per cent of the Jews and 71 per cent of the non-Jews were correctly identified. When a threefold breakdown was asked for, the percentages of correct identifications were 52 for the Mediterraneans, 49 for the Jews, and 75 for the North Europeans. However, when percentages of correct identifications are based on those *called* Jews and non-Jews in the twofold breakdown, the results are somewhat lower for the Jews and higher for the non-Jews—52 and 78 per cent. Using the threefold classification of Jewish, Mediterranean, and North European, the percentages correctly labeled were 58, 54, and 58, respectively.

Carter found a "small" relationship between degree of prejudice and the number of slides classified as belonging to the group toward which prejudice is expressed in the twofold Jewish–non-Jewish set of judgments. This relationship becomes "insignificant" when the threefold classification is required. "No consistent relationship" is found for the more prejudiced judges to be more accurate in their identification of Jews. On the basis of these findings, the author questions the general applicability of Allport and Kramer's findings.

Lindzey and Rogolsky[6] have essentially repeated Allport and Kramer's study, using 685 undergraduate judges. They found the mean accuracy in identification of twenty photographs (ten each of Jews and non-Jews) to be 13.4. This figure is higher than Allport and Kramer's figure of "about eleven out of twenty" correct responses. This is at least partly explicable by Lindzey and Rogolsky's allocation of "Don't know" responses proportionately to each judge's "Jewish" and "non-Jewish" responses—a questionable procedure. Along with other results, the authors found support at a prearranged 5 per cent level of significance for Allport and Kramer's findings that individuals who score high in prejudice are more accurate in their identification of Jews and tend to label more faces as Jewish.

Elliott and Wittenberg[7] give evidence to contradict the findings of Allport and Kramer and of Lindzey and Rogolsky that the positive relationship between anti-Semitic attitudes and accuracy in identifying Jewish and non-Jewish photographs is due to the greater skill of prejudiced persons. They claim that this may be a spurious relationship attributable to the anti-Semite's tendency to judge more faces as Jewish. To test this, the authors used three samples of twenty photographs from a 1949 Wayne University yearbook. Of Sample I, 75 per cent were Jews; of Sample II, 25 per cent were Jews; and, of Sample III, 50 per cent were Jews. The seventy student judges identified only a mean of 8.8 out of twenty faces correctly in Sample I. In Samples II and III the means were 10.3 and 8.8. These results

[5] Launor F. Carter, "The Identification of 'Racial' Membership," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology,* XLIII (July, 1948), 279–86.

[6] Gardner Lindzey and Saul Rogolsky, "Prejudice and Identification of Minority Group Membership," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology,* XLV (January, 1950), 37–53.

[7] Donald N. Elliott and Bernard H. Wittenberg, "Accuracy of Identification of Jewish and Non-Jewish Photographs," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology,* LI (September, 1955), 339–41.

This content downloaded from 131.111.164.128 on Tue, 24 Nov 2015 07:35:12 UTC
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

amount to 44, 52, and 44 per cent correctly identified; the last two are below chance expectation. Elliott and Wittenberg found a positive relationship between anti-Semitic attitude scores and accuracy of identification *only* for the 75 per cent Jewish sample. This indicates that the alleged accuracy of identification of Jews may be a function of a bias of the anti-Semites in judging more faces to be Jewish.

Scodel and Austrin[8] have further investigated the question of the relationship between prejudice and response bias in labeling photographs as Jewish, on the one hand, and the accuracy of identification, on the other. They also have attempted to determine differences between Jews and non-Jews on these two points. One hundred and eighteen Jewish and 194 non-Jewish undergraduates judged a hundred photographs (thirty "Jews," thirty "Americans," twenty "North Europeans," and twenty "South Europeans"), obtained from various sources, as of either Jews or non-Jews. Each student was also asked to choose the thirty photographs he thought most likely to be of Jews. Among Jews and non-Jews the more prejudiced tended to label more photographs as Jewish than the less prejudiced, but in neither group was there a significant difference in accuracy between those of high and low prejudice. Jews, however, were slightly more accurate than non-Jews and showed a tendency to label more photographs as Jewish. The authors claim that both groups did better than chance in identifying Jewish faces, but they then go on to say that "whether Jews can be identified better than chance, however, is a relatively meaningless question [in this case], since accuracy is obviously dependent on the nature of the group from which Jews are being selected." All these findings are significant to at least a 5 per cent level.

In general, these studies indicate that there is a tendency on the part of anti-Semites to choose more faces as Jewish, and this probably explains the likelihood that they will appear more accurate in their identification of Jews. Paradoxically, the only study that investigated differences between Jewish and non-Jewish judges found that the former judged more faces to be Jewish and were more accurate than the non-Jewish judges. There also appears to be a general allocation preference for taking Jews for non-Jews rather than the reverse, except when there is a sizable proportion of Mediterraneans in the population judged. And there is a marked variation in the range of identifiability of Jews from about 40 to 65 per cent, a variability which seems to be partly a function of the proportion of Mediterraneans in the total population judged.

Our study differs from these previous investigations in several ways: the identification was of live individuals rather than of photographs because, though it entails numerous disadvantages, we thought it more "realistic"; judgments were made under three sets of conditions; and all analyses were made in terms of a Jewish–non-Jewish breakdown of judges and subjects.

METHOD

The problem is the extent to which Jews may be accurately identified and the degree to which this perceivability is attributable to physiognomic or cultural attributes such as gesticulation and articulation and the names of the subjects. Toward this end, six individuals attempted to identify 57 male and 34 female undergraduates previously unknown to them.

The six judges were male doctoral candidates in the social sciences. Half were Jewish and had resided for considerable periods in areas of high Jewish concentration; the three non-Jewish judges, on the other hand, had had limited contact with Jews.

The subjects were four freshman classes at the University of Pennsylvania; two classes ("Introductory Sociology") were all male, and two classes ("English Composition") all female. Crucial data concerning

[8] Alvin Scodel and Harvey Austrin, "The Perception of Jewish Photographs by Non-Jews and Jews," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, LIV (March, 1957), 278–80.

This content downloaded from 131.111.164.128 on Tue, 24 Nov 2015 07:35:12 UTC
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

the subjects were obtained by having them complete a four-page "background" questionnaire. The true purpose of both the questionnaire and the study itself was kept from the students, in part, by including a number of decoy or irrelevant questions, for example, fraternity and political affiliations, number of siblings, etc.[9]

The relevant information consisted of the religious affiliation and the birthplace of the subject and his parents. The questions were so constructed as to "force" some affiliation, for example, "What are you? Protestant Catholic Jewish (Circle one)." Two of the students who had one Jewish and one non-Jewish parent were arbitrarily dropped.

The test itself consisted of having the six judges make three separate judgments, at different times, of all the subjects, placing each student on a four-point scale:

A. I am almost positive he (she) is a Jew.
B. I guess he (she) may be a Jew.
C. I guess he (she) may be a non-Jew.
D. I am almost positive he (she) is a non-Jew.

"Don't know" responses were not allowed. After some deliberation, it was decided, in order to permit simple statistical manipulation, to collapse these four categories into two: Jewish (A and B) and non-Jewish (C and D).

In the test on the first level, the judges based their judgment as nearly as possible on physiognomy alone.[10] While the subjects completed the questionnaires, which took from twenty-five to thirty minutes, the judges, in the front of the classroom, marked "A," "B," "C," or "D" for each student in the appropriate place on a seating chart.

[9] Subsequent to the tests some Jewish students said that they would have "acted" differently and spoken more slowly and precisely had they been aware of the true purpose of the study.

[10] Two judges suggested a possible influence of the seating arrangement, that is, a tendency for Jews to sit beside Jews. But a check revealed only a slight tendency, if any, of this sort. One judge claimed that he might have been influenced by a possible Jewish–non-Jewish difference in haircuts. All judges agreed that they perceived no difference in dress.

The second level of judgment was made several weeks later. The students discussed a number of "non-loaded" questions asked by their instructor during normal class. Each male subject talked enough for judgment to be made for all. Over the women students, however, the investigators had less control, and only a minority of girls spoke at sufficient length to permit judgments to be made. In this test, judgments were based on physical appearance plus speech and gestures.

On the third level, again after several weeks,[11] each student stood up in class, gave his complete name, spelled his surname, and mentioned the last motion picture he had seen and made critical comments on it. The judgments now were based on physiognomy, articulation, gesticulation, and name.

The tests themselves were additive in nature in that each one contained additional clues which, it was assumed, aided in the correct identification of Jews. On the second level, judgment was based not only on physical appearance but on verbalization, regional accent, and gestures. On the third, the judges used all these clues, with the subject's name in addition.

RESULTS

Table 1 discloses that the male subjects were accurately identified well above chance on Level I.[12] Correct identification amounted to 62 per cent of all judgments of the Jewish and 82 per cent of the non-Jewish subjects. The differences between the Jewish and non-Jewish judges were quite small. On the second level the over-all identification of Jewish subjects dropped from 62 to 52 per cent,

[11] One of the Jewish judges was not present for the third test of the women. Because of this and with our lack of experimental control over the class during the second test of judgments of women, we have dropped the female population from this study except for an occasional mention. The data, in tabular form, are available to anyone interested.

[12] We have regarded p as equal to .5 in the statement of our null hypothesis. The assumption here is that each judgment was a separate and discrete choice between "Jew" and "non-Jew" and was unrelated to either the estimated or the actual percentage of Jews among the subjects.

This content downloaded from 131.111.164.128 on Tue, 24 Nov 2015 07:35:12 UTC
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

the Jewish judges remaining relatively constant, while the non-Jewish judges dropped from 64 per cent on Level I to 42 per cent on Level II. With the non-Jewish subjects, however, correct judgments rose to 93 per cent, both sets of judges increasing their accuracy considerably and maintaining it at about this high point on Level III judgments. On the third level, Jewish subjects were correctly identified in 90 per cent of the cases by the Jewish judges and in 78 per cent by the non-Jewish judges.

Whereas Table 1 deals with accuracy in identifying *actual* Jewish and non-Jewish subjects, Table 2 shows the percentage of correct identification among those *called* Jews or non-Jews who actually were Jews or non-Jews. Thus this table, in contradistinction to Table 1, shows a regular and substantial increase in correct identification on each level, from 74 to 86 to 89 per cent for Jewish male subjects and from 73 to 70 to 88 per cent for non-Jewish male students.

Table 3 discloses that at each of the three

TABLE 1

PERCENTAGE OF CORRECT IDENTIFICATION OF JEWISH AND NON-JEWISH MALE UNDERGRADUATES, BY LEVEL, FOR JEWISH AND NON-JEWISH JUDGES

(N = Number of *Actual* Jews or Non-Jews To Be Identified by Judges)*

	Level I		Level II		Level III	
	J	NJ	J	NJ	J	NJ
	N:%	N:%	N:%	N:%	N:%	N:%
Jewish Judge No. 1	24:71	31:77	24:67	28:93	23:100	31:93
Jewish Judge No. 2	24:67	29:79	23:74	28:93	23:91	31:87
Jewish Judge No. 3	24:42	31:97	24:46	28:93	23:78	27:96
Total Jewish judges	72:60	91:85	71:62	84:93	69:90	89:92
Non-Jewish Judge No. 1	24.58	30:87	24:42	28:86	23:74	27:93
Non-Jewish Judge No. 2	24:75	30:60	24:50	28:96	23:87	27:85
Non-Jewish Judge No. 3	24:58	31:94	23:35	28:96	23:74	27:96
Total non-Jewish judges	72:64	91:80	71:42	84:93	69:78	81:91
Total all judges	144:62	182:82	142:52	168:93	138:84	170:92
Percentage of incorrect judgments —all judges	38	18	48	7	16	8

* Variations in the N's are attributable to absences of the subjects or inadvertent omission by the judges.

TABLE 2

PERCENTAGE OF MALES CALLED "JEWS" AND "NON-JEWS" WHO ACTUALLY WERE JEWS AND NON-JEWS, BY LEVEL, FOR JEWISH AND NON-JEWISH JUDGES

(N = Number of Individuals *Called* Jewish or Non-Jewish)

	Level I		Level II		Level III	
	J	NJ	J	NJ	J	NJ
	N:%	N:%	N:%	N:%	N:%	N:%
Jewish Judge No. 1	24:71	31:77	18:89	34:76	25:92	29:100
Jewish Judge No. 2	22:73	31:74	19:89	32:81	25:84	29:93
Jewish Judge No. 3	11:91	44:68	13:85	39:67	19:95	31:84
Total Jewish judges	57:75	106:73	50:88	105:74	69:90	89:92
Non-Jewish Judge No. 1	18:78	36:72	14:71	38:63	19:89	31:81
Non-Jewish Judge No. 2	30:60	24:75	13:92	39:69	24:83	26:88
Non-Jewish Judge No. 3	16:88	39:74	9:89	42:64	18:94	32:81
Total non-Jewish judges	64:72	99:74	36:83	119:66	61:89	89:83
Total all judges	121:74	205:73	86:86	224:70	130:89	178:88

This content downloaded from 131.111.164.128 on Tue, 24 Nov 2015 07:35:12 UTC
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

levels the non-Jewish male students were more highly visible than their Jewish counterparts. Thus, on Level I, 41 per cent of all non-Jewish students were unanimously identified by the six judges, in contrast to 30 per cent of the Jewish subjects. In the second series of judgments, the corresponding percentages were 68 and 9, while on the last level they were 73 and 55, respectively. At the other extreme, 43 per cent of the Jewish and 13 per cent of the non-Jewish male subjects were identified by three or fewer judges on the first level; this differential increased on the second level to 59 and 4 per cent, respectively. On the third level the differential decreased to 14 and 8 per cent. The actual distributions are compared here with the expected, derived through the binomial expansion. All the distributions significantly exceeded chance expectations at the upper end of the scale of visibility except for Level II judgments of Jews.

TABLE 3

PERCENTAGE OF JEWISH AND NON-JEWISH MALE UNDERGRADUATES IDENTIFIED CORRECTLY BY ALL 6 JUDGES, BY 5 OUT OF 6, BY 4 OUT OF 6, THROUGH 0 OUT OF 6 JUDGES COMPARED WITH PER CENT CHANCE EXPECTATIONS, BY LEVELS

(N = Number of Individuals)*

Correct Identification	Chance Expectation	Level I		Level II		Level III	
		J† ($N=23$)	NJ† ($N=29$)	J ($N=22$)	NJ† ($N=28$)	J† ($N=22$)	NJ† ($N=26$)
6 out of 6.....	2	30	41	9	68	55	73
5 out of 6.....	9	13	24	18	25	18	15
4 out of 6.....	23	13	21	14	4	14	4
3 out of 6.....	31	17	10	18	4	9	4
2 out of 6.....	23	4	3	27	0	5	4
1 out of 6.....	9	13	0	9	0	0	0
0 out of 6.....	2	9	0	5	0	0	0
Total.....	99	99	99	100	101	101	100
Mean no. of correct identifications.....	3.0	3.4	4.9	3.2	5.6	5.1	5.6

* The variable N's are explained by the exclusion of any individual on any level upon whom all of the judges did not make judgments.

† Indicates a distribution that could have occurred by chance $<.05$. The significance test used was the Kolmogorov-Smirnov One—Sample Test. See Sidney Siegel, *Nonparametric Statistics* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1956), pp. 47–52.

The percentages here arrived at are not generalizable. Had we used females rather than males, or businessmen rather than social science graduate students, as judges, the results would perhaps be different. Or if the judges were of different ethnic or regional backgrounds, or from different academic fields, the proportion of correct identifications might have been somewhat different. If, on the other hand, the subjects were older individuals instead of college undergraduates, or if the population contained different proportions from particular ethnic groups, again the findings would probably be different. If, for instance, there had been more students of Italian and Greek background among our subjects, the percentage of correct identifications of Jews would probably be lower. In view of this, the findings can be regarded as significant *only* as they might shed light on the *relative differentials in the identifiability of Jews and non-Jews*.

The significant points arising from this study are the following:

Jews are identifiable by physiognomy beyond chance, within the sampling limitations already cited. Sixty-two per cent of the Jewish males were correctly identified in this manner; and correct identifications of those *classified* as Jews (Table 2) amounted to 74 per cent. For, while 2 per cent of the Jewish subjects should, by chance expectation, have been identified unanimously by all six judges (Table 3), actually, 30 per cent of the Jewish males were correctly identified

This content downloaded from 131.111.164.128 on Tue, 24 Nov 2015 07:35:12 UTC
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

by all six judges. (The comparable percentages for the female population were 67, 71, and 13.)

Jewish males were less often correctly identified than non-Jewish males on all levels. (This was true of the female sample, too, but to a lesser extent.) There are two possible kinds of errors: judging a Jew to be a non-Jew or judging a non-Jew to be a Jew. Errors of the former kind, however, are much more frequent than errors of the latter among both Jewish and non-Jewish judges. Table 1 shows the percentage of incorrect judgments of the Jewish males on the three levels to be 38, 48, and 16, but for non-Jewish males the corresponding percentages are 18, 7, and 8. Table 3 shows a markedly smaller proportion of Jewish than non-Jewish males to be correctly identified by six out of six and five out of six judges. There are, however, large differences in allocation preference on the three levels. On Levels I and III, taking a Jew to be a non-Jew is about twice as frequent as taking a non-Jew to be a Jew; on Level II, however, this preference is on the order of seven to one. (Lund and Berg found it to be about nine to one.)

That the judges erred in the direction of taking Jews to be non-Jews rather than the reverse cannot be explained here by assuming that the judges underestimated the proportion of Jewish students in the population judged. A check of the judges showed that they estimated with fair accuracy the actual Jewish–non-Jewish composition of the male and female populations.[13] It may be due to the presence of a "liberal bias" on the part of the judges that they assign the higher status of non-Jew when in doubt. Or the explanation may be simpler; it may be due to a tendency to resolve doubtful cases in favor of the most numerous class. (Of related interest here is the well-supported finding that anti-Semitic individuals show the opposite disposition to judge more individuals to be Jews.)

Unexpectedly, there is a *decrease* in the percentages of correct identifications from 62 to 52 for Jewish males as one passes from Levels I to II (Table 1). Greater identifiability was expected on tests of Level II because the clues of speech and gesture were added to physiognomy, the criterion of Level I. When the Jewish and non-Jewish judges are compared, it will be seen that the diminished correctness of identification is limited wholly to the non-Jewish judges. The percentages of correct identification for Jewish males, on the two levels for the Jewish judges remained constant (60 and 62), but, among the non-Jewish judges, it dropped from 64 to 42.

A possible explanation of this may be an identification on the part of the non-Jewish judges, particularly, of "non-Jewishness" with individuals who do not betray characteristics of Eastern urban speech and gesture, which few of the male students have. These findings also suggest that speech and gesture are stronger determinates of judgment than physiognomy, *even though they are less valid*.[14]

When in doubt, most judges apparently classified an individual as a non-Jew. (We believe that this is independent of the proportions in the population judged.) This tendency creates the impression of significantly lower identifiability of Jews than of non-Jews (Table 1). In order to eliminate this bias, Table 2 was constructed to depict the percentages of correct identifications using as the denominator the number of subjects *called* Jews or non-Jews rather than the number of *actual* Jews or non-Jews. For example, on Level I, when the number of *actual* Jews is used as the denominator, correct identifiability is 62 per cent (Table 1),

[13] The six judges estimated the percentages of Jewish male students in the population as follows: 45, 30–35, 50, 30–35, 40–50, and 50–60. Their judgments for the percentages of Jewish women were as follows: 35, 20, 30–40, 40, 40–50, and 40. Actually, 41 per cent of the men were Jewish and 45 per cent of the women.

[14] We were under the impression that the Jewish subjects who were correctly identified on Level II less seldom than on Level I would be largely from outside the New York–New Jersey–Philadelphia area. Such did not prove to be the case.

This content downloaded from 131.111.164.128 on Tue, 24 Nov 2015 07:35:12 UTC
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

but, when the number of individuals *called* Jews is used, correct identifiability jumps to 74 per cent (Table 2). At all levels the correct identification of Jews is more frequent, and of non-Jews less frequent in Table 2.

Table 2, however, may set up an opposite distortion, exaggerating the accuracy and perception of Jews by the judges. Here high accuracy is correlated with the classification of a small number of individuals as Jews. Jewish Judge No. 3 correctly identified only 42 per cent of the 24 Jewish male subjects on the first level, and, similarly, Non-Jewish Judge No. 3 was 58 per cent accurate for the same students (Table 1). But, using as a basis those *called* Jews (Table 2), Jewish Judge No. 3 was 91 per cent correct, but he only classified 11 males as Jews; likewise, Non-Jewish Judge No. 3 was 88 per cent accurate, taking only 16 males to be Jews.

In Table 2 the increased accuracy from Level I (74 per cent) to Level II (86 per cent) appears related to the drop in the number of individuals classified as Jews from 121 on the first level to 86 on the second. Possibly, the "articulatory-gesticulatory" clues conflicted with certain stereotypes of "Jewishness." As most of the males were of middle or upper economic status, few revealed such speech or gestures.

The name, however, apparently had high predictive value for the judges. Correct identifications reached their highest point for Jewish subjects on this third level, and the differential between Tables 1 and 2 became minimal. Table 1 discloses that 84 per cent of the judgments were now correct, while Table 2 reveals an accuracy of 89 per cent, even though the number of individuals classified as Jews was the highest for any test (130).

There were a sizable percentage of Jewish subjects who were very highly visible, that is, identified by all six judges, on the basis of physiognomy. Table 3 reveals that 30 per cent (7 out of 23) of the Jewish males were so identified. There were also several (2 out of 23) "invisible" Jews, that is, incorrectly identified by all judges. This distribution was unique to the first level. With the introduction of the "articulation-gesticulation" clue, the number of highly visible and invisible Jews diminished. Finally, when names were added, over half the Jewish subject population became highly visible. It might be noted that, on this third level, there were no longer any invisible Jews, and, indeed, only one male (5 per cent) was correctly identified by fewer than two judges.

For the non-Jewish the distributions were more skewed in the direction of high visibility on all three levels. Forty-one per cent of the non-Jews were highly visible on the first level, 68 per cent on the second, and 73 per cent on the third. Indeed, only one subject (3 per cent) on Level I and one subject (4 per cent) on Level III were correctly identified by fewer than three judges. We have already quoted the disposition, when in doubt, to classify the subject as non-Jewish.

In judging the undergraduates, there was little difference in the ability of Jewish and non-Jewish judges to identify correctly on Level I, where cultural differentials are least significant. On Levels II and III, however, where cultural elements are crucial, the Jewish judges were more accurate in identifying Jewish males than were the non-Jewish. On Level II the percentage of correct responses by Jewish judges was 62 and by non-Jewish judges 42, while on Level III the percentages were 90 and 78, respectively. There appears to be no difference in ability to identify non-Jews correctly: the percentages of correct responses on Level II was 93 for both groups of judges, while on Level III the percentages were 92 and 91. In short, Jewish judges are apparently better judges of Jewish males than are non-Jewish judges when cultural attributes are introduced, and there is barely any difference on any level in the ability of the two groups of judges to judge non-Jewish males correctly. As Table 2 indicates, this cannot be explained by their tendency to judge more faces as Jewish.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA
AND
BUTLER UNIVERSITY

This content downloaded from 131.111.164.128 on Tue, 24 Nov 2015 07:35:12 UTC
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions